

REMARKS

The Action of December 23, 2005 includes a number of rejections and a drawing objection. The substantive rejections are being answered by way of an appeal. Applicants are submitting comments regarding the objection to the drawings herewith.

It is further noted that the drawing objections correspond to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 17-23. That rejection will be answered in the Appeal Brief, but corresponds to the following comments.

The Examiner states that the drawings must show every feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner specifically indicates that the "container directly mounted on and protruding from the stator" in claim 17 must be shown. The Examiner believes that the drawings only show that the container is directly mounted on and protruding from the chassis. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's understanding of the invention.

The Examiner is referred to the paragraph found on page 6, lines 14-29 of the original application, which was revised in the Amendment of June 18, 2005. As indicated therein the container for the motor controller 43 includes two positioning pillars 42 disposed on the lower cover portion. These are seen as the two pillars having rectangular cross-sections on either side of the vertical slot seen in the coils around the stator in Fig. 4. The controller 43 slides between these two pillars before the stator is mounted on the chassis 41. Thus, this arrangement is similar to that shown in Fig. 3 where the controller slides between two pillars (321 in Fig. 3).

The Examiner states that the drawings only show that the container is directly mounted on and protruding from the chassis. This is incorrect. The pillars 42 which constitute the container are directly mounted on and protrude from the stator (in the downward direction). The two pillars form a slot therebetween into which the controller is placed. Thus, Applicants submit that the feature of claim 17 indicated by the Examiner is indeed shown in Fig. 4. The Examiner's confusion seems to arise from the fact that the pillars 42 actually constitute the container and are not separate therefrom. The Examiner admits that Fig. 4 shows the pillars 42

Application No. 10/772,322
Response dated March 23, 2006
After Final Office Action of December 23, 2005

Docket No.: 0941-0911P

protruding from the stator. Accordingly, since the pillars form the container, the Examiner has indicated that indeed the language of claim 17 is shown.

In view of the above comments, Applicants submit that the drawing objection is incorrect and should be removed.

Dated: March 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Joe McKinney Muncy

for Registration No.: 32,334 *#43362*
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

PM 8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant